

REMARKS

The foregoing amendment corrects the specification in order to obviate the examiner's rejection and amends the claims by inserting into Claims 1 and 11 the limitations of Claim 8.

Specification

The foregoing amendment obviates the examiner's objection to the wrong reference numeral that appears on page 17, line 25, of the application as filed. Applicants appreciate the courtesy of the examiner in calling this matter to their attention.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

All the claims have been rejected for failure to comply with the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Applicants submit that this rejection is erroneous and request reconsideration.

This application is intended to cover the embodiment shown in Fig. 3 of the application. Fig. 3 is discussed in the written description at paragraph 0051-0053. Paragraph 0052 indicates that the applicator, in the form of a cylindrical roller is identical to the cylindrical roller 25 of Fig. 2. Furthermore, paragraph 0052 indicates that the cylindrical roller is mounted in the top 33 of container 30. The analogous description for Fig. 2 is in paragraph 0049 which indicates that the cylindrical roller 25 is mounted on closure member 24. Despite the differences in language ("top" for Fig. 3 and "closure member" for Fig. 2), it is readily apparent from the drawing that these describe identical structures. Thus, the disclosure of embodiment shown in Fig. 3 can reasonably be read as defining that applicator 37 is removable.

In the foregoing amendment, the limitations of Claim 8 have been incorporated into Claims 1 and 11. Claim 8, now redundant, has been cancelled. With respect to the examiner's criticism of Claim 8, it is respectfully pointed out that Fig. 3 of the drawings and the written description associated therewith discloses a restricted outlet in the form of an applicator that comprises a roller or a roller ball. There was never any intention to

claim an applicator and a roller or roller ball as separate components. Reference numeral 37 shows a cylindrical roller. In paragraph 0049, there is a statement to the effect that cylindrical roller 25 of Fig. 2 (identical to cylindrical roller 37 of Fig. 3) can be replaced by a roller ball.

In summary, it is submitted that the written description in this application clearly meets the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112 for all of the claims remaining in this application.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 6, 7 and 11 were rejected as obvious over Chaudhri US Patent No. 5,769,553 in view of Yaneza US Patent No. 4,957,125. The foregoing amendment incorporates the substance of Claim 8 into all of the claims in this application. Since Claim 8 was not included among the rejected claims, this rejection no longer applicable to any of the claims in this application.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendment and these remarks, it is believed that all remaining claims in this application are in condition for allowance. Favorable action is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 23 March 2005

Frederick H. Rabin
Reg. No. 24,488

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906